

the way to freedom. To them I urge less dependence on counter organizations to battle with privilege. Privilege can afford to scorn tactics in which it has always been, and must be, master as long as it is permitted to masquerade as capital. For honest capital is beneficent and impregnable. Privilege has stolen its good name and wears it as an armor.

As Lowell tells us:

There is more force in names than most men dream of,  
And a lie may keep its throne a whole age longer  
If it lurk behind the shield of some fair-seeming name.

#### An Illustration.

I beg the working man who hears me to think less of restrictive measures, which are but a copy, in form, of protection, and sure in the end to react upon labor, and unite to strike at the cause of their oppression and discontent. Let him take a lesson from the less enlightened Kaffirs of South Africa, who recently brought the proud mine owners to their terms, using neither force nor organization. The Chamber of Mines, in Johannesburg, representing nearly 170 concerns, gold as well as coal, undertook to reduce the wages of the native miners, who had no organization of any kind. The old average rate of wages was fifty shillings a month, and the boys were lodged and fed at the mine compounds. Although able to pay enormous dividends on this expenditure, the greedy mine owners desired to increase them by reducing the laborers' pay to thirty shillings a month, and proceeded on that basis. The effort proved to be vain. No mine could obtain its full complement of workers, and, after months of determined effort, in November last, the Chamber was reluctantly compelled to yield and the old rates were restored. The victory involved no organized strike nor wailing delegates.

A correspondent of the Boston Transcript explains the mystery, without a suspicion that he was giving a capital illustration of the theory of Henry George. He writes: "For the natives, the eighteen months' contest has been the easiest win in the history of the industrial world. The native had no trade union to help him in the conflict which the Chamber of Mines had forced upon him. But all South African natives have a little land. A native can easily live out of his mealie patch; and when the powerful Chamber of Mines issued its decree that the native was worth only thirty shillings a month, and determined to fix this as the rate at the mines all over South Africa, the natives called for no meetings, held no demonstrations, nor asked for any sympathetic strike or boycotts. They simply kept to their mealie patches, and while they remained there the mines on the Rand were at a standstill, and thousands of stockholders in England, Germany, and France

were without dividends on their mining securities."

#### What Shall the Answer Be?

The obvious moral is that where land is locked up from the man seeking employment he must work on his employer's terms or starve. With open opportunities to work for himself, no capitalist can oppress him, but must employ him on just and satisfactory terms. Now, as Bliss Carman states it:

There is no man alive, however he may strive,  
Allowed to own the work of his own hands.  
Landlords and waterlords, at all the roads and fords,  
Taking their tolls, imposing their commands.

Not until he is made the lord of his own trade,  
Can any man be glad or strong or free;  
There looms the coming war. Which captain are you for,

The chartered wrong, or Christ and liberty?

When that question is answered deliberately by the people, it will be determined whether democracy is to survive or perish in this land.

♦ ♦ ♦

## THE BASIS OF THE FILIPINO APPEAL.

Manual L. Quezon, Resident Commissioner of the Philippine Islands in the United States, in an Article Written for the Sacramento Bee.

Since it has been my privilege to represent the Filipino people on the floor of the American House of Representatives, I have encountered an apparently very general willingness in this country to permit my people to go ahead and set up a government of their own and proceed to enjoy what your Declaration of Independence calls "the pursuit of happiness," in their own way instead of in somebody else's way; provided, the American people be convinced:

First: That my beloved compatriot, Speaker Osmena, of the Filipino Assembly, and myself, and the rest of the Young Filipino Party, would not at once cut each other's throats in a mad scramble for the offices; and

Second: That if we were given this independence that we are forever pleading for, Japan, Germany or England, or some other power, will not annex the Islands on the first pretext.

The general impression among the American people as to the ability of the Filipinos to institute and maintain a government of their own, is, perhaps, well expressed in the following utterance made in 1900 by one of the statesmen of this country: "To grant self government to Luzon under Aguinaldo would be like granting self government to an Apache reservation under some local chief." If you turn to the famous Senate Document No. 62 there may be found a report by General J. Franklin Bell, since Chief of Staff of

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

the United States Army, then a Major on General Merritt's staff, in which General Bell gives pen pictures or character sketches of General Aguinaldo and his leading officers and refers to Aguinaldo as "a sincere patriot and a born leader of men." These notes of General Bell were not "bouquets." They were careful notes by a born fighter as to the calibre of the men with whom collision might come later. As I happen to have been a Major on General Aguinaldo's staff during the late "unpleasantness," I have reasons to know that I can subscribe to the opinion thus expressed.

Honorable George Curry, recently Governor of New Mexico, who commanded one of the troops of Colonel Roosevelt's Regiments in the Santiago campaign, authorized me not long ago to quote him as being of the opinion that there would be no trouble at all about the Filipino people running a decent Government of their own, satisfactory to all concerned. Governor Curry lived among us some eight years, and was Governor of three or four provinces. He knows us as well as any other American does. Judge James H. Blount, who fought against the Filipinos as a Captain of U. S. Volunteers, and later on was Judge of the Court of First Instance for a number of years, by appointment of President Taft, said in some article, which appeared in the "North American Review," in 1907, and which was given wide publicity in the form of reprints distributed at the expense of Mr. Andrew Carnegie, who gave a large sum for that purpose:

*It three strong and able men, familiar with insular conditions and still young enough to undertake the task . . . were told by the President of the United States, by authority of Congress—"go out there and set up a respectable native government in ten years, and then come away"—they could and would do it, and that government would be a success; and one of the greatest moral victories in the annals of free government would have been written by the gentlemen concerned upon the pages of their country's history.*

Honorable William Jennings Bryan, who has visited the Philippines, reprinted Judge Blount's article in "The Commoner" and endorsed its conclusions editorially. President Schurman of Cornell University, who was President of the First Philippine Commission sent by President McKinley, has, some time since, been expressing himself as a firm believer of Filipino ability for self government.

Before the American Government decided to keep the Philippines, Admiral Dewey said that we were better fitted for self government than the Cubans. Those famous words of your famous Admiral, concerning my people, occurred in a letter signed by him and addressed to the Secretary of the Navy under date of August 29, 1898. The letter is one of the documents which

accompanied the treaty of Paris in Senate Document No. 62 of the Session of Congress of the winter 1898 and 1899.

He says:

In a telegram sent to the Department on June 23, I expressed the opinion that "this people are far superior in their intelligence and more capable of self-government than the natives of Cuba, and I am familiar with both races." Further intercourse with them has confirmed me in this opinion.

When that letter was written the Government of the Philippine Republic was "a going concern"—a bona fide, patriotically supported de facto government—all over the Philippine Islands. Honorable John Barrett, now Director-General of the Pan-American Union, formerly United States Minister to Siam, wrote of Aguinaldo, the President of that government, under date of January 16, 1899:

He has organized a government which has been administering the affairs of that great Island (Luzon) since the American occupation in Manila. . . . He has a properly formed cabinet and Congress, the members of which, in appearance and manners, would compare favorably with Japanese statesmen. He has amongst his advisers men of acknowledged ability as international lawyers, while his supporters include most of the prominent educated and wealthy natives.

Of our Congress, Mr. Barrett wrote:

These men, whose sessions I repeatedly attended, conducted themselves with great decorum and showed a knowledge of debate and parliamentary law that would not compare unfavorably with the Japanese Parliament. The executive portion of the Government was made up of a ministry of bright men who seemed to understand their respective positions.

Thus, prominent Americans who are familiar with my people, expressed their opinion as to our capability for self-government.

The independence of the Philippine Archipelago can be protected and guaranteed by a neutralization treaty whereby the signatory powers would all promise the United States and each other not to grab the Islands.

Belgium and Switzerland have long been protected by just such neutralization treaties. Some people brush aside the suggestion by saying that such a treaty would be respected only until some one of the signatory Powers should "need the Philippines in its business," and that then, such Power would unblushingly annex them. But there is where the mutual jealousy of the Powers would be the sure salvation of my country. During the Franco-Prussian war there was some talk, both in France and Germany, of seizing Belgium. But both these nations being, as Great Britain also was, parties to a treaty under which it had been agreed that Belgium should forever remain neutral territory, Great Britain notified both parties to the conflict, that if either should

violate the territorial integrity of Belgium she would at once take sides with the other. If "balance of power" consideration in Europe has preserved the integrity of Turkey up to the present time, without a neutralization treaty, why will not a treaty actually signed by all the great Powers making the Philippines neutral territory forever, be respected by the several nations signing it, since the one great subject ever held under jealous surveillance by the statesmen both of Europe and Japan, as well as of the United States, is the "balance of power" in the Pacific? Neutralization has long been recognized by the advanced thought of America as the key to the way out of the Philippine Islands.

So far as I can learn, I do not see why the great Powers will not welcome a treaty for the neutralization of the Philippine Islands; besides other reasons, because it would forever reduce by that much the possible area of war. The sincerity of the leading nations in their plea for peace will be found out in their answer to the question, "Will you consent to the neutralization of the Philippine Islands?"

To sum up, I assert: That

If the Philippine Islands were protected by a neutralization treaty whereby the signatory Powers would all promise the United States and each other not to seize the Islands, after they have been declared independent, an agreement the signing and faithful keeping of which the mutual jealousy of the Powers will most happily insure, my people can set up, at any time, and maintain forever a respectable government of their own, amply adequate for the protection of life and property and capable of fulfilling all international obligations.

\* \* \*

### GLOUCESTER.

From the Gloucester Fishermen's Institute Annual Report.

Maker of men, when men are worth  
The highest price the times can hoard;  
She tosses heroes on the deep,  
As hands toss dice across a board.

To run the trawl, to fight the storm,  
To face no peril, though he can,  
To rate his life like frozen bait;  
He asks no more—our fisherman.

He hurls upon the brutal gale  
The spirit of his pioneer;  
There is no alphabet in him  
That halts to spell the pale word, fear.

Give us the sailor soul that dares,  
Nor counts the cost, whate'er it be;  
Give us the patience of the coast,  
That weeps—a woman—by the sea.

## BOOKS

### AN AFTERMATH OF THE CIVIL WAR.

Reminiscences of the Geneva Tribunal. By Frank Warren Hackett. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1911.

This is a very readable account by an actor in it, of one of the most interesting international arbitrations that ever took place. Those of us old enough to remember the contention between Great Britain and the United States concerning the so-called "Alabama Claims," realize, as others cannot perhaps, how near the terrible calamity of a war between the two countries, the resentment of Americans and the pride of Englishmen brought us. Happily, the false sentiments concerning "national honor," which are a cheap substitute for true patriotism, did not bring about what at different stages in the controversy seemed imminent.

The greater credit for averting the danger and securing the inestimably valuable example of the two high-spirited nations settling by arbitration a grave dispute which had brought them to the brink of war, was due not to the arbitrators or to the counsel for the respective nations at Geneva, but to the Joint High Commission appointed by the two governments in 1871 which framed the Treaty of Washington providing for the Tribunal.

The gratitude owed to them impels me to recall their names. England was represented by the Marquis of Ripon, Sir Stafford Northcote, Sir Edward Thornton, Montague Bernard and Sir John MacDonald. The first two were prominent statesmen of Great Britain of opposite political opinions. Thornton was the British Minister to the United States, Bernard Professor of International Law at Oxford and MacDonald Premier of Canada. The Commissioners of the United States were Secretary of State Fish, General Schenck (Minister of the United States to Great Britain), Mr. Justice Nelson of the Supreme Court of the United States, Judge Hoar (then the Attorney General) and Senator George F. Williams of Oregon. These Commissioners approached their work in a spirit of mutual concession and good will, much at variance with the prevailing spirit on this side of the Atlantic at least. The treaty they negotiated provided for a tribunal of arbitration on "the Alabama Claims," and laid down for its governance three rules of international law concerning the duty of neutrals, which it may be noted were subsequently made also by Parliament a part of the local law of Great Britain.

But the great merit of the Treaty, after all, was that in skillfully chosen and dignified language it contained an apology by Great Britain, neither unbecoming in her to make nor in the United States

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY